

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/566,668	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GENESTE ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Maryam Monshipouri	<b>Art Unit</b> 1656

**All Participants:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) *Maryam Monshipouri*. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) *Mr. G. Patrick Sage*. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 10 June 2008

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:**  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*112 second, 112 first*

**Claims discussed:**

*21, 30-32, 36, 39,*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the examiner on 5/29/08 called applicant and requested proper Markush recitation in claim 21. She also raised written description issues directed to the phrase "pathologies involving deregulation of apoptosis" recited in claim 39. With respect to claims 30-32, the examiner requested identification of BCL-2 family members in said claims. In response Mr. Sage, amended claims 21, 30-32 and canceled claim 39 and filed an amendment on 6/3/08. Subsequently on 6/10/08, the examiner called Mr. Sage and inquired how claim 36 was further limiting than claim 30, its base claim. Mr. Sage in response, gave authority to the examiner to cancel claim 36 in an Ex. amendment.